

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
MEETING
MAY 15, 2007**

The regular session of the Auburn City Historic Design Review Commission was called to order on May 15, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Merz in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Kosla, Smith, Thompson, Worthington, Briggs, Elder, Kidd, Chrm. Merz

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Will Wong, Community Development Director; Steve Geiger, Associate Planner; Michael Colantuono, City Attorney; Sue Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM III: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC COMMENT

Betty Jensen, 171 Tennis Way, Auburn shared that the Grass Valley City Council approved two co-housing projects last week. She noted a few highlights for a possible co-housing project on Blocker Drive.

ITEM V: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Historic Design Review – 185 Linden Avenue (Frank R. Lewis) – File HDR 07-8.** The applicant requests Historic Design Review approval for illuminated and non-illuminated wall signs located at 185 Linden Avenue. *This item was continued from the April 3, April 17 and May 1, 2007 Historic Design Review Commission hearings to allow the applicant to work with staff on a revised proposal.*

Planner Geiger gave the staff report. When the applicant initially came before the Commission, the Commission voted

to continue the item to allow time for the applicant to work with staff on a revised proposal. The new proposal includes a single wall sign on the second floor facing Lincoln Way, two hanging signs to be located at the building's front porch area, and a free standing sign to be located in the existing landscape planter in front of the building.

The second floor wall sign would be approximately 3'x7' in size. It is to be made of exterra which is similar to wood, and will have raised lettering made from sheet PVC. The sign is to be painted white, with green vinyl trim to match the building trim color. Two curved light fixtures are to be placed above the sign to be painted black to provide indirect lighting for the sign. The sign size meets the size requirements of the sign ordinance.

Two hanging signs are proposed on the Linden Avenue side to be located on the porch. They will be a smaller version of the wall sign, 1 1/2' x 6' in size, and will comply with the size requirements of the sign ordinance.

A proposed freestanding sign will have a 4' x 6' face, constructed of exterra with sheet PVC letters. The sign will have the State Farm Insurance logo centered on the top portion of the sign. Below the logo will be the words "State Farm" and "Frank Lewis". The logo and the lettering will be in red. The applicant would like to include his phone number and web address on the sign in a similar font but smaller size, and to be painted black. The sign will be located between two 4"x 4" posts which will match in color and style with the porch posts on the building. Indirect lighting for the signs will be provided by a 3 foot long bar light. The light housing and conduit will be painted black. The applicant has indicated that existing landscaping in the planter area will provide screening of the light fixture. Staff is recommending a condition requiring that appropriate landscaping be provided and maintained to visually screen the conduit and back sides of these bar light fixtures.

Planner Geiger noted that the photo simulations contained in Exhibit B depicting the freestanding sign location and size are not accurate. The applicant used a photo of an existing freestanding sign in front of City Hall for his simulations. The dimensions of the applicant's proposed freestanding sign are actually larger than the City Hall sign.

Staff believes the revised proposal is consistent with the Historic Preservation Architectural Design Guidelines and is

recommending approval of the revised proposal for one wall sign, two hanging signs, and one freestanding sign.

Comm. Worthington asked to view a sample of the PVC lettering, which Planner Geiger provided.

Comm. Worthington asked if the letters are considered to be high quality.

Planner Geiger responded that they are.

Comm. Worthington asked if the number of signs proposed is consistent with the sign ordinance.

Planner Geiger replied that they are. The only limitation is that only one freestanding sign is allowed. There are no limits for hanging signs or wall signs, as long as the allowance for the building frontage is not exceeded.

Comm. Worthington asked if the placement of the wall sign on the second story is in the proper placement according to the HDRC guidelines.

Planner Geiger replied that the Commission has the authority to approve that location. At the last meeting for this proposal the applicant presented the Commission with a possible sign proposal for a sign of this same type and design, and was given the impression that this type of sign at the second story location would be acceptable.

Comm. Worthington asked why the freestanding sign does not match the wall and hanging signs in shape and design.

Planner Geiger suggested that this question be asked of the applicant.

Comm. Thompson asked if the green outline color on the sign matches the trim on the building.

Planner Geiger replied that it will match.

Comm. Kosla stated that in the previous meeting for this proposal, he had suggested to the applicant that he return with a good reason why the second story signage is necessary.

Comm. Elder asked if there may be an alternative location for the hanging signs.

Planner Geiger replied that he believes the applicant didn't want the signs blocking the decorative shutters.

The public hearing was opened.

The applicant, Frank Lewis, 185 Linden Avenue, Auburn clarified that the reason for the placement of the hanging signs is to prevent blocking the architectural details at the top of the windows. With regard to the wall sign, he clarified that the white above the State Farm will be raised to match the detail above the windows.

Comm. Kosla asked Mr. Lewis to explain the reason for the second story sign.

Mr. Lewis replied that people would have a difficult time finding his business without a sign on the second story.

Comm. Smith asked if the freestanding sign will utilize the same style as the City Hall sign.

Mr. Lewis replied that it will more closely match the detail on his building.

Comm. Worthington asked Mr. Lewis why he wishes to put his phone number and web address on the freestanding sign.

Mr. Lewis said he feels that it would be a good idea to let people know this information.

Comm. Worthington asked why the freestanding sign does not have the same style as the other signs do.

Mr. Lewis responded that he wants the sign to represent his business. He varied the other signs for a better fit to the building style.

Comm. Elder asked if the building is ADA accessible.

Mr. Lewis noted that the building is wheelchair accessible via a ramp in the rear of the building.

Donna Howell, 405 Linden Avenue, Auburn, suggested that rather than two hanging signs on the Linden Avenue side, only one sign be placed over the stairs. She thinks having the sign on the second story is too much. She said she likes the freestanding sign better than the ones proposed on the building. She thinks that four signs are too much.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Kosla stated that the applicant has done a good job on his revised proposal. He feels the second story sign is necessary at this location, and the front monument sign makes sense. He likes this proposal and supports it.

Comm. Smith said that he thinks the applicant did a great job with this new proposal, however he objects to the second story sign.

Comm. Thompson thinks the applicant has made great strides and supports this proposal as presented.

Comm. Worthington stated that she feels the freestanding sign is too large. She would like to see more consistency between the signs and is not in favor of the use of the phone number and web address.

Comm. Briggs stated that she likes all of the signs, but feels that all four signs are too many for the house. She said she would support the use of two signs: the second story wall sign and the freestanding sign.

Comm. Elder said she is opposed to the second story sign.

Comm. Kidd stated that she believes the second story sign is needed, however she would like for the freestanding sign to be smaller. She agrees that the two porch signs are not needed.

Comm. Kidd **MOVED** to:

Adopt Resolution No. 07-7 as modified by the Historic Design Review Commission, to approve the applicant's request for one illuminated freestanding sign with the condition that the sign face size be reduced to 3' x 5', and one second story illuminated sign as proposed by the applicant, located at 185 Linden Avenue.

Comm. Briggs **SECONDED**.

There was discussion about this motion.

For clarification, Comm. Kidd restated the motion.

Comm. Briggs seconded.

Comm. Kosla expressed his desire to amend the motion. City Attorney Colantuono gave direction about how this could be done.

Comm. Kosla **MOVED** to:

Amend Comm. Kidd's motion to Adopt Resolution No. 07-7 as modified by the Historic Design Review Commission, to approve the applicant's request for one illuminated freestanding sign with the sign face size reduced to 3' x 5', one second story illuminated sign and the two hanging signs proposed by the applicant, located at 185 Linden Avenue.

No second was necessary.

AYES: Kosla
NOES: Smith, Thompson, Worthington, Briggs, Elder,
Kidd, Chrm. Merz
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was denied.

Comm. Kidd restated the original motion to:

Adopt Resolution No. 07-7 as modified by the Historic Design Review Commission, to approve the applicant's request for one illuminated freestanding sign with the condition that the sign face size be reduced to 3' x 5', and one second story illuminated sign as proposed by the applicant, located at 185 Linden Avenue.

AYES: Thompson, Worthington, Briggs, Kidd, Chrm. Merz
NOES: Kosla, Smith, Elder
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

The applicant was advised that he has 10 days to appeal the Commission's decision.

Comm. Smith asked about the time limit for the applicant to remove the banners on the building.

Planner Geiger replied that a condition contained in the resolution gives the applicant until May 25, 2007 to remove the banners.

ITEM VI: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A. City Council Meetings
Director Wong reported that last night the City Council approved the revisions to the Sign Guidelines.
- B. Future Historic Design Review Commission Meetings
There will be a meeting on June 5, 2007.
- C. Reports
None.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE HISTORIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

Comm. Worthington asked staff when the Historic paint palette will be reviewed by the Commission.

Director Wong replied that staff is working on that now.

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant